

Mercury Citizens Advisory Committee Suggested Retreat Work Plan

Tuesday, April 30th and Wednesday, May 1st

*All Elements of this Retreat Work Plan are Advisory and Subject to
Discussion and Alteration*

Goals:

**Work Efficiently / Deal with seven key issues that relate directly to the rule/
Draft Final Recommendations /Conclude this Process**

Location:

Wisconsin Dells - Site not yet determined

Potential Madison site due to State Budget travel restrictions

Public meeting:

All open meeting rules apply

Schedule

Tuesday, April 30

10:00 - 10:50

Discussion of Issue Brief & Developing Alternatives:

Issue A – Trading: Should compliance with the proposed mercury rules include provision for emission reduction credits created from mercury product collection projects or pollution reduction projects?

10:50 – 11:40

Discussion of Issue Brief & Developing Alternatives:

Issue B – Industry Caps: Should major industrial sources have requirements in the proposed rules that place a cap on their annual mercury emissions?

11:40 – 1:00

Lunch -- working/non-working?

1:00 – 1:50

Discussion of Issue Brief & Developing Alternatives:

Issue C – Growth: The requirement for new sources to offset increases in mercury emissions. This would include new electric utility boilers as well as any new industrial source that could annually emit 10 pounds of mercury or more.

1:50 – 2:40	<u>Discussion of Issue Brief & Developing Alternatives:</u> Issue D – Electric Reliability: Are the variance procedures adequate to safeguard electric reliability?
2:40 – 3:30	<u>Discussion of Issue Brief & Developing Alternatives:</u> Issue E – Mercury Reduction Requirement: The schedule and stringency of mercury emission reductions required of the four major electric utilities.
3:30 – 4:20	<u>Discussion of Issue Brief & Developing Alternatives:</u> Issue F – Balancing State and Federal Regulation: What is the relationship between a Wisconsin regulation and pending federal regulations that will require mercury emission reductions from electric utility boilers and industrial boilers?
4:20 – 5:30	<u>Discussion of Issue Brief & Developing Alternatives:</u> Issue G – Periodic Rule Evaluation: The frequency and content of the rule evaluations for the Natural Resources Board.
5:30 – 7:00	Break – together/on own?
7:00 – 10:00	Working session/working session only if necessary?

Wednesday, May 1

7:00 / 7:30 / 8:00	Starting time?
Start – Noon	Working session: Review alternatives developed on the first day of the retreat; develop consensus where possible and finalize the range of alternatives Issues A, B, C & D
Noon	Lunch – working/non-working?
1:00 – 3:00/4:00/5:00?	Working session: Review alternatives developed on the first day of the retreat; develop consensus where possible and finalize the range of alternatives Issues E, F & G

Process

- Open discussion style as modeled at the March 6th meeting
- Each Issue/Priority will be given an equal amount of time
- All Issues/Priorities will be given the amount of time agreed upon or be concluded before any particular Issue/Priority is given more than the allotted time
- Discussion captured publicly/instantly on flipcharts
- Staff uses captured discussion points to draft report recommendations
- Committee Members have ten days within which to offer feedback on the final recommendations as drafted by staff, including back-and-forth offerings.

Outcome – Product!

- Concludes process developing recommendations for CAC priorities (Consensus where possible, or range of alternatives)
- Write recommendations for Department Issue Briefs (Consensus where possible, or range of alternatives)
- Bottom line: Recommendations to Secretary
- No more meetings! (Except for the possibility of a follow-up / evaluation before the recommendation report is considered final)

Ground Rules – Retreat

- Time limits for each priority item (20 minutes?)
- Time limit per comment (1 minute?)
- Limits on number of comment “moments” per Committee Member?
- Comments must be kept on point
- Designate a hand signal whereby any member of the group could remind the speaker that they are straying from the point of the conversation
- Agreed upon time limit for caucus (5 minutes?)
- Agreed upon limit to number of caucus periods that can be requested during a particular session (two?)
- Audience offers only non-verbal input by way of parking lot for recognition at the end of each session or by submitting written comments to prompt members who share their point of view regarding some point they may be missing.
- Alternates are not at the table if the Committee Member is present
- Alternates in the audience (as distinguished from other audience members) may suggest a “caucus” to their person at the table via a written note – no verbal communication between Alternates and anyone at the table while session is in progress
- Caucus can only be requested by a committee member at the table
- All original committee ground rules apply